



# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast  
Status Report

August 2020 ■ [www.FRAC.org](http://www.FRAC.org)



# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

## Summer Breakfast Status Report

### Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Clarissa Hayes and Crystal FitzSimons of the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC).

FRAC gratefully acknowledges lead sponsorship of this report from the Kellogg Company Fund.

FRAC also acknowledges the following for supporting its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs:

- The From Now On Fund of Tides Foundation;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- Nourishing Neighbors, a program of Albertsons Companies Foundation;
- National Recreation and Park Association;
- Walmart.org; and
- YMCA of the USA.

Support of FRAC's work to expand and improve the child nutrition programs has been provided by the following:

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous;
- Chobani;
- Eos Foundation;
- General Mills Foundation;
- The JPB Foundation; and
- Newman's Own Foundation.

### About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition. For more information about FRAC, Summer Nutrition Programs, or to sign up for FRAC's *Meals Matter Newsletter* or FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit [frac.org](http://frac.org).



# Executive Summary

Every day during the regular school year, millions of low-income children participate in the national School Breakfast Program, a program proven to support students' [academic achievement, behavior, and health](#), while also ensuring their nutritional needs are met. The critical role that breakfast plays in children's overall well-being does not end when the school year does.

The Summer Nutrition Programs are designed to replace school lunches and breakfasts by providing funding to sponsors, such as schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations to offer meals at sites that typically provide educational, enrichment, or recreational activities that keep children learning, active, and safe when school is not in session. As a result, these programs help fight food insecurity, weight gain, and learning loss, ensuring children are able to thrive during summer break and beyond. Despite the many benefits, these programs are not used widely enough to meet the need.

Although the Summer Nutrition Programs provide funding to serve two meals a day at most sites, too many sites provide just lunch or lunch and a snack. This means sponsors not only miss out on an important opportunity to combat summertime food insecurity by better meeting children's nutritional needs, but they also are not maximizing the amount of federal reimbursements they could draw down to support their programs.

This report analyzes participation in the summer breakfast component of the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2019, compared to participation in summer lunch during the same time.

## Key Findings

- Only 1.5 million children received a breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs on an average weekday in July 2019, compared to nearly 2.8 million children who received a lunch.
- Nationally, 54.8 children received breakfast for every 100 who received lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs.
- FRAC sets a national benchmark of reaching 70 children with summer breakfast for every 100 who participate in summer lunch. If this benchmark had been reached, 421,000 additional children would have received a summer breakfast on an average weekday in July 2019, and states would have received nearly \$21 million in additional federal funding.
- Participation in summer breakfast decreased by nearly 17,000 participants, or 1.1 percent, from July 2018 to July 2019.
- To account for the significant variation among states in summer lunch participation, FRAC analyzes each state's reach in summer breakfast and summer lunch. Six states — Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, and Vermont — and the District of Columbia had strong participation in breakfast and lunch.

Growing the number of children participating in summer breakfast programs is a win-win for summer sponsors and the children they serve. There are several [strategies](#) that schools and sponsors can implement to reach more children with summer breakfast. Adding breakfast to existing lunch sites is the easiest way to reach additional children. Moving breakfast later in the morning or serving breakfast instead of a morning snack are other steps that sponsors can take to boost summer breakfast participation.

As the country struggles to recover from COVID-19, advocates and stakeholders on the national, state, and local level must redouble efforts to fully maximize the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs to close the widening nutrition gap. The implementation of best practices, combined with the policy recommendations included in [Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report](#), would help these programs regain lost ground and connect more families to much-needed summer nutrition when the school year ends.

## About This Report

This report measures the reach of breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2019, nationally and in each state, and is a companion piece to the Food Research & Action Center's (FRAC) [Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report](#), which focuses on summer lunch participation.

This summer breakfast report is based on a variety of metrics and examines the impact of trends and policies on program participation. In this report, FRAC

- assesses national and state breakfast participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs;
- measures July 2019 breakfast participation against July 2018 participation in lunch by calculating the ratio of children participating in summer breakfast for every 100 children participating in summer lunch, using the lunch data reported in the companion report;
- analyzes participation by placing states in one of four groups:

- states with strong participation in summer breakfast and summer lunch;
- states with strong breakfast participation relative to weak lunch participation;
- states with weak breakfast participation relative to strong lunch participation; and
- states with weak participation in breakfast and lunch;
- measures year-over-year changes in summer breakfast participation by state;
- sets an ambitious but achievable goal of reaching 70 children with summer breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs for every 100 participating in summer lunch;
- calculates the number of unserved children and the federal dollars lost in each state that is not meeting this goal; and
- identifies best practices for providing summer breakfast.

### The Summer Nutrition Programs

The federal Summer Nutrition Programs — the Summer Food Service Program and the “Seamless Summer Option” (through the School Breakfast Program and the National School Lunch Program) — provide funding to serve meals and snacks to children at sites where at least 50 percent of the children in the geographic areas are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; at sites where at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are individually determined to be eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; and at sites that serve primarily migrant children. Once a site is determined eligible, all children can eat for free.

Summer camps also can participate, but they are only reimbursed for the meals served to children who are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. The School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program also reimburse schools for providing meals to children who attend summer school based on the

individual child's eligibility for free or reduced-price school meals.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local government agencies, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in the Summer Food Service Program and operate one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to operate the federal School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program, but schools can provide meals and snacks at both non-school and school sites over the summer.

Most sites can provide a maximum of two meals per day — breakfast and lunch, breakfast and dinner, or a meal and a snack, but not both lunch and dinner, and not two meals and a snack. Sites that serve primarily migrant children and summer camps, however, can provide three meals.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture provides the funding for these programs through a state agency in each state, which is usually the state department of education.

## National and State Findings

The Summer Nutrition Programs served breakfast to a little more than 1.5 million low-income children on an average weekday in July 2019 — just over half (54.8 percent) of the nearly 2.8 million low-income children who received a summer lunch. Participation in summer breakfast in July 2019 dropped from the previous year, serving 17,000 fewer children — a 1.1 percent decrease.

Average daily participation in the summer lunch programs varied widely across the states, and for most states, a low level of participation in summer lunch sets an artificially low bar for comparing summer breakfast participation. Likewise, strong summer lunch participation in a particular state sets a much higher bar for summer breakfast participation. To account for this, the Food Research & Action Center groups states into four categories for this analysis.

### Group 1: Strong Participation in Both Summer Breakfast and Lunch

In July 2019, six states and the District of Columbia had strong participation in both summer breakfast and lunch when compared to other states. For these top performers, at least one child received summer lunch

#### Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup>

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
District of Columbia	14,983	37.7	11,043	73.7
Vermont	7,928	33.5	4,930	62.2
New Mexico	44,973	27.7	24,378	54.2
New York	354,712	27.5	253,744	71.5
Maine	14,216	26.5	7,719	54.3
Maryland	65,366	23.1	45,113	69.0
New Jersey	91,698	22.4	68,935	75.2



for every five low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2018–2019 regular school year. This group of states also served more than half as many children summer breakfast as those who received summer lunch.

### Group 2: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast But Weak Participation in Summer Lunch

Twenty-four states succeeded in providing summer breakfast to at least half as many children as those who received summer lunch. But these states fell far short of the Food Research & Action Center’s benchmark for summer lunch performance, with ratios of summer-to-school-year lunch not only below the benchmark for summer lunch of 40 children to 100, but below 20 to 100.

Ten of these states (Louisiana, West Virginia, Texas, Mississippi, Nevada, Hawaii, Missouri, Alabama, Arkansas, and Michigan) ranked among the 20 states with the lowest ratios of summer lunch participation in the country, reaching only between 5.1 and 11.1 children for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year. While it is encouraging that these states served summer breakfast to the majority of children eating summer lunch, too many children are still missing out on both meals. This group needs to expand breakfast and lunch programs to reach more children.

<sup>1</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>2</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

**Group 2: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast<sup>3</sup> but Weak Participation in Summer Lunch<sup>4</sup>**

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
Hawaii	5,230	8.7	4,370	83.5
New Hampshire	4,848	15.2	3,788	78.1
Connecticut	34,736	19.0	24,702	71.1
Virginia	60,598	14.3	41,592	68.6
Louisiana	21,419	5.1	13,791	64.4
Minnesota	48,114	18.4	30,784	64.0
Massachusetts	52,392	16.5	33,267	63.5
Mississippi	20,316	7.3	12,812	63.1
West Virginia	8,923	6.6	5,615	62.9
Texas	182,871	7.3	113,129	61.9
Delaware	10,673	17.6	6,574	61.6
Nevada	13,731	8.0	8,267	60.2
Missouri	30,036	9.0	17,675	58.8
South Carolina	53,772	15.9	31,603	58.8
Georgia	112,495	13.6	64,357	57.2
Wisconsin	42,470	15.5	24,068	56.7
Arkansas	24,577	11.1	13,764	56.0
North Carolina	85,055	13.9	47,427	55.8
Pennsylvania	83,734	13.1	44,501	53.1
Michigan	60,720	11.1	31,664	52.1
Arizona	69,099	15.7	35,564	51.5
Illinois	86,772	11.7	44,499	51.3
Alabama	35,691	10.1	18,281	51.2
Florida	189,431	13.8	96,145	50.8

**Group 3: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast Relative to Strong Participation in Summer Lunch**

One state lagged in serving breakfast, even while it achieved relatively strong summer lunch participation ratios: Montana (19.9 to 100). While Montana is among the top 10 states in the country for summer lunch participation, Montana had a summer breakfast-to-lunch ratio below 50 to 100. By adding breakfast to summer lunch sites, this state could have easily increased children’s access to a morning meal and joined the other states in Group 1 that had strong participation in summer breakfast and summer lunch.

**Group 3: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast<sup>3</sup> Relative to Strong Participation in Summer Lunch<sup>4</sup>**

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
Montana	8,955	19.9	3,533	39.5

**Group 4: Weak Participation in Both Summer Breakfast and Summer Lunch**

The remaining 19 states, similar to the states in Group 2, fell short of even a modest standard of serving summer lunch to at least one child for every five children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year. These states also fell short in breakfast; they failed to provide summer breakfast to even half of this already small subset of eligible children. For example, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, and Oklahoma provided summer lunch to less than one-tenth of the number of children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year, and they served breakfast to less than half of the small lunch number. With low

<sup>3</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>4</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

participation in both summer breakfast and lunch, these states leave much room for improvement to ensure that children have access to adequate nutrition when school is out during the summer.

**Group 4: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast<sup>5</sup> and Summer Lunch<sup>6</sup>**

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
Rhode Island	8,047	16.7	3,855	47.9
Tennessee	55,011	12.2	26,133	47.5
Ohio	61,575	10.4	29,199	47.4
Nebraska	8,761	7.3	3,659	41.8
California	398,577	16.5	165,411	41.5
Indiana	63,377	15.1	26,157	41.3
Washington	35,688	10.9	13,980	39.2
Colorado	19,773	9.5	7,622	38.5
Iowa	18,466	10.4	7,083	38.4
Kentucky	41,449	10.3	15,556	37.5
Oregon	30,030	16.0	10,919	36.4
Kansas	16,744	9.5	5,919	35.3
North Dakota	3,172	10.1	1,112	35.1
Oklahoma	14,501	4.9	5,043	34.8
Alaska	4,160	11.2	1,432	34.4
Wyoming	4,161	18.7	1,151	27.7
Idaho	16,154	18.9	3,612	22.4
South Dakota	7,131	15.8	1,549	21.7
Utah	26,870	18.2	3,896	14.5

**Change in Summer Breakfast Participation From July 2018 to July 2019**

Sixteen states expanded participation in summer breakfast from July 2018 to July 2019, and four of these states increased participation by more than 10 percent. Utah led the way with a 19.9 percent increase in the number of children receiving breakfast, followed by Texas (15.5 percent) and Arizona (12.4 percent), demonstrating that dramatic improvement is possible. The numbers for each state are in Table 1.

**Top 10 Increases in Summer Breakfast<sup>5</sup> Average Daily Participation (ADP), July 2018 to July 2019**

State	ADP, July 2018	ADP, July 2019	Percent Change
Utah	3,248	3,896	19.9%
Texas	97,966	113,129	15.5%
Arizona	31,634	35,564	12.4%
Kentucky	14,070	15,556	10.6%
Missouri	16,332	17,675	8.2%
South Carolina	30,110	31,603	5.0%
Massachusetts	31,753	33,267	4.8%
Minnesota	29,473	30,784	4.4%
Hawaii	4,186	4,370	4.4%
Wisconsin	23,086	24,068	4.3%

<sup>5</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>6</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

By contrast, 28 states and the District of Columbia saw breakfast participation decline by at least 10 percent over the same period. The starkest drops were in South Dakota (-49.5 percent), Oklahoma (-30.4), and North Dakota (-24.7 percent).

### 10 States With the Largest Declines in Summer Breakfast<sup>7</sup> Average Daily Participation (ADP), July 2018 to July 2019

State	ADP, July 2018	ADP, July 2019	Percent Change
South Dakota	3,070	1,549	-49.5%
Oklahoma	7,247	5,043	-30.4%
North Dakota	1,476	1,112	-24.7%
West Virginia	7,256	5,615	-22.6%
Louisiana	17,123	13,791	-19.5%
Rhode Island	4,613	3,855	-16.4%
Tennessee	30,895	26,133	-15.4%
Washington	15,980	13,980	-12.5%
Maine	8,744	7,719	-11.7%
Mississippi	14,448	12,812	-11.3%

### Missed Opportunities — Children’s Well-Being and Federal Dollars

On an average weekday in July 2019, five states and the District of Columbia provided nutritious breakfasts to at least 70 children per 100 participating in summer lunch. A summer breakfast ratio of 70 to 100 is an attainable goal for the other 45 states. The Food Research & Action Center calculated how many additional children would have been served on an average weekday if they had reached this goal, and how much additional funding each state would have received in the form of federal reimbursements. The numbers for each state are in Table 2.

Cumulatively, states with summer breakfast ratios below 70 to 100 in July 2019 would have served breakfast to

nearly 421,000 additional children had they all achieved the 70-to-100 goal. States would have received an additional \$20.9 million in federal reimbursements.

California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Texas, and Utah together would have served more than half of the additional children, and would have claimed more than half of the additional reimbursements. Roughly one-quarter of the additional federal dollars would have gone to California alone (see Table 2).

## Conclusion

The Summer Nutrition Programs provided breakfast to only 1.5 million children on an average weekday in July 2019, serving just 54.8 children for every 100 who participated in summer lunch during the same month. The limited reach of summer breakfast when compared to summer lunch, which also is failing to meet the need, serving only one child for every seven low-income children who receive a school lunch, further exacerbates the summer nutrition gap for millions of low-income children.

As communities continue to respond to the impacts of COVID-19 on food security, education, and the economy, the need to fully maximize the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs is more important than ever. When combined, summer breakfast and lunch better meet the nutritional needs of low-income children, and efforts to increase participation and access must focus on both in order to more fully support struggling families.

Through the implementation of summer breakfast-specific [best practices](#), the policy recommendations highlighted in [Hunger Doesn’t Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report](#), and collaboration on the federal, state, and local levels, the reach of both summer breakfast and summer lunch will increase, ensuring every child has access to the summer learning and summer meals they need to succeed.

<sup>7</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.



---

## Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and from an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC). This report does not include data for the Summer Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

In this report, “summer breakfast” is defined as the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) breakfast service in July, plus the average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July. “Summer lunch” is the sum of the average daily participation in SFSP lunch service in July plus the average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in July. The SBP and NSLP numbers include participation through the Seamless Summer Option.

FRAC uses July data because it is impossible to determine for June and August how many days were regular school days and how many were summer vacation days. Due to limitations in USDA’s data, it also is not possible in those months to separate NSLP data to determine if meals were served as part of the Seamless Summer Option or as part of the regular school year, but the regular school meal share is likely to be smallest in July.

Due to rounding, totals in the tables may not add up to 100 percent.

### SFSP Average Daily Participation

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP breakfasts and lunches served in July in each state. FRAC calculated each state’s July average daily breakfast participation in SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP breakfasts served in July by the total number of weekdays in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). FRAC used the same method to calculate average daily SFSP lunch participation. The average daily participation numbers for July reported in FRAC’s analysis are slightly different from USDA’s average daily participation numbers, which are based on operating days instead of the total number of weekdays in July. FRAC’s revised measure allows for consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily NSLP lunch participation numbers in the regular school year, as described below.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the data on the total number of breakfasts and lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA. The state changes are reflected in the tables.

### SBP and NSLP Average Daily Participation

SBP and NSLP data are separate from Summer Food Service Program data. FRAC used the July average daily participation figures provided by USDA for the summertime SBP and NSLP participation data in this report. The SBP and NSLP summer meal numbers include all of the free and reduced-price breakfasts and lunches served during July. This includes meals served at summer school, meals served through the Seamless Summer Option, and meals served on regular school days (during July).

Note that USDA adjusts average daily participation in the regular school year SBP and NSLP by dividing the average daily meal figures by an attendance factor (0.927) to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard* for the regular school year reports these SBP and NSLP average daily participation numbers; that is, it includes the attendance factor. To make the SBP and NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, this report does not include the attendance factor. As a result, the regular school year meal participation numbers in this report do not precisely match the SBP and NSLP numbers in FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard, School Year 2018–2019*.

### The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving summer nutrition breakfasts in July for every 100 children receiving summer nutrition lunches. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 70-to-100 ratio of summer nutrition breakfast participation to summer nutrition lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the SFSP summer breakfast reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2019, not counting the Independence Day holiday). FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available (\$2.255 per breakfast for July 2019).

**Table 1:****Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup> in July 2018 and July 2019, and Ratio and Rank, by State (Alphabetically)**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2018	Summer Lunch ADP, July 2018	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2019	Summer Lunch ADP, July 2019	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Percent Change in Breakfast ADP
Alabama	18,857	36,351	51.9	29	18,281	35,691	51.2	30	-3.1%
Alaska	1,491	3,719	40.1	44	1,432	4,160	34.4	47	-4.0%
Arizona	31,634	56,979	55.5	21	35,564	69,099	51.5	28	12.4%
Arkansas	14,326	24,246	59.1	16	13,764	24,577	56.0	22	-3.9%
California	169,348	413,455	41.0	42	165,411	398,577	41.5	36	-2.3%
Colorado	8,382	19,588	42.8	39	7,622	19,773	38.5	40	-9.1%
Connecticut	24,697	33,977	72.7	5	24,702	34,736	71.1	6	0.0%
Delaware	6,731	10,415	64.6	10	6,574	10,673	61.6	16	-2.3%
District of Columbia	12,311	15,274	80.6	2	11,043	14,983	73.7	4	-10.3%
Florida	98,632	194,458	50.7	31	96,145	189,431	50.8	31	-2.5%
Georgia	71,421	140,181	50.9	30	64,357	112,495	57.2	20	-9.9%
Hawaii	4,186	5,353	78.2	3	4,370	5,230	83.5	1	4.4%
Idaho	3,722	17,869	20.8	50	3,612	16,154	22.4	49	-3.0%
Illinois	43,227	87,412	49.5	33	44,499	86,772	51.3	29	2.9%
Indiana	28,190	68,609	41.1	41	26,157	63,377	41.3	37	-7.2%
Iowa	7,184	18,625	38.6	46	7,083	18,466	38.4	41	-1.4%
Kansas	5,959	17,154	34.7	48	5,919	16,744	35.3	44	-0.7%
Kentucky	14,070	35,528	39.6	45	15,556	41,449	37.5	42	10.6%
Louisiana	17,123	24,918	68.7	9	13,791	21,419	64.4	9	-19.5%
Maine	8,744	15,214	57.5	18	7,719	14,216	54.3	24	-11.7%
Maryland	45,095	65,425	68.9	8	45,113	65,366	69.0	7	0.0%
Massachusetts	31,753	53,772	59.1	17	33,267	52,392	63.5	11	4.8%
Michigan	35,370	65,338	54.1	25	31,664	60,720	52.1	27	-10.5%
Minnesota	29,473	46,437	63.5	13	30,784	48,114	64.0	10	4.4%
Mississippi	14,448	24,034	60.1	15	12,812	20,316	63.1	12	-11.3%
Missouri	16,332	29,343	55.7	20	17,675	30,036	58.8	18	8.2%
Montana	3,975	9,091	43.7	37	3,533	8,955	39.5	38	-11.1%
Nebraska	3,551	8,470	41.9	40	3,659	8,761	41.8	35	3.0%
Nevada	8,290	13,688	60.6	14	8,267	13,731	60.2	17	-0.3%
New Hampshire	3,996	4,826	82.8	1	3,788	4,848	78.1	2	-5.2%
New Jersey	69,523	95,512	72.8	4	68,935	91,698	75.2	3	-0.8%
New Mexico	24,283	45,816	53.0	26	24,378	44,973	54.2	25	0.4%
New York	247,219	348,387	71.0	6	253,744	354,712	71.5	5	2.6%
North Carolina	50,879	90,724	56.1	19	47,427	85,055	55.8	23	-6.8%
North Dakota	1,476	2,823	52.3	28	1,112	3,172	35.1	45	-24.7%
Ohio	29,355	61,926	47.4	34	29,199	61,575	47.4	34	-0.5%
Oklahoma	7,247	16,612	43.6	38	5,043	14,501	34.8	46	-30.4%
Oregon	10,857	30,808	35.2	47	10,919	30,030	36.4	43	0.6%
Pennsylvania	47,385	89,416	53.0	27	44,501	83,734	53.1	26	-6.1%
Rhode Island	4,613	9,235	50.0	32	3,855	8,047	47.9	32	-16.4%
South Carolina	30,110	54,749	55.0	22	31,603	53,772	58.8	19	5.0%
South Dakota	3,070	7,640	40.2	43	1,549	7,131	21.7	50	-49.5%
Tennessee	30,895	69,516	44.4	36	26,133	55,011	47.5	33	-15.4%
Texas	97,966	178,430	54.9	24	113,129	182,871	61.9	15	15.5%
Utah	3,248	25,886	12.5	51	3,896	26,870	14.5	51	19.9%
Vermont	5,041	7,826	64.4	12	4,930	7,928	62.2	14	-2.2%
Virginia	44,688	64,294	69.5	7	41,592	60,598	68.6	8	-6.9%
Washington	15,980	34,867	45.8	35	13,980	35,688	39.2	39	-12.5%
West Virginia	7,256	11,228	64.6	11	5,615	8,923	62.9	13	-22.6%
Wisconsin	23,086	41,996	55.0	23	24,068	42,470	56.7	21	4.3%
Wyoming	1,139	4,012	28.4	49	1,151	4,161	27.7	48	1.1%
US	1,537,831	2,851,457	53.9		1,520,922	2,774,183	54.8		-1.1%

<sup>1</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus the average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>2</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus the average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

**Table 2:**

**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 70 Summer Breakfast Participants per 100 Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup> Participants**

State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2019	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch <sup>3</sup>	Total Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100 <sup>4</sup>
Alabama	18,281	51.2	24,983	6,703	\$332,519
Alaska	1,432	34.4	2,912	1,480	\$73,415
Arizona	35,564	51.5	48,369	12,806	\$635,292
Arkansas	13,764	56.0	17,204	3,440	\$170,653
California	165,411	41.5	279,004	113,593	\$5,635,359
Colorado	7,622	38.5	13,841	6,219	\$308,535
Connecticut	24,702	71.1	24,315	met goal	met goal
Delaware	6,574	61.6	7,471	897	\$44,493
District of Columbia	11,043	73.7	10,488	met goal	met goal
Florida	96,145	50.8	132,602	36,456	\$1,808,605
Georgia	64,357	57.2	78,747	14,390	\$713,891
Hawaii	4,370	83.5	3,661	met goal	met goal
Idaho	3,612	22.4	11,308	7,695	\$381,773
Illinois	44,499	51.3	60,740	16,242	\$805,751
Indiana	26,157	41.3	44,364	18,207	\$903,251
Iowa	7,083	38.4	12,926	5,843	\$289,887
Kansas	5,919	35.3	11,721	5,803	\$287,865
Kentucky	15,556	37.5	29,014	13,458	\$667,643
Louisiana	13,791	64.4	14,993	1,202	\$59,621
Maine	7,719	54.3	9,951	2,232	\$110,739
Maryland	45,113	69.0	45,757	643	\$31,914
Massachusetts	33,267	63.5	36,675	3,408	\$169,056
Michigan	31,664	52.1	42,504	10,840	\$537,760
Minnesota	30,784	64.0	33,680	2,896	\$143,653
Mississippi	12,812	63.1	14,221	1,409	\$69,907
Missouri	17,675	58.8	21,025	3,350	\$166,188
Montana	3,533	39.5	6,268	2,735	\$135,695
Nebraska	3,659	41.8	6,133	2,474	\$122,730
Nevada	8,267	60.2	9,612	1,345	\$66,730
New Hampshire	3,788	78.1	3,394	met goal	met goal
New Jersey	68,935	75.2	64,189	met goal	met goal
New Mexico	24,378	54.2	31,481	7,103	\$352,379
New York	253,744	71.5	248,298	met goal	met goal
North Carolina	47,427	55.8	59,538	12,111	\$600,831
North Dakota	1,112	35.1	2,221	1,108	\$54,984
Ohio	29,199	47.4	43,103	13,903	\$689,753
Oklahoma	5,043	34.8	10,150	5,107	\$253,382
Oregon	10,919	36.4	21,021	10,102	\$501,148
Pennsylvania	44,501	53.1	58,614	14,113	\$700,131
Rhode Island	3,855	47.9	5,633	1,778	\$88,218
South Carolina	31,603	58.8	37,641	6,038	\$299,538
South Dakota	1,549	21.7	4,992	3,442	\$170,764
Tennessee	26,133	47.5	38,508	12,375	\$613,918
Texas	113,129	61.9	128,010	14,881	\$738,261
Utah	3,896	14.5	18,809	14,913	\$739,840
Vermont	4,930	62.2	5,550	619	\$30,717
Virginia	41,592	68.6	42,419	826	\$41,000
Washington	13,980	39.2	24,982	11,001	\$545,782
West Virginia	5,615	62.9	6,246	632	\$31,344
Wisconsin	24,068	56.7	29,729	5,661	\$280,861
Wyoming	1,151	27.7	2,913	1,761	\$87,372
US	1,520,922	54.8	1,941,928	421,006	\$20,886,094

<sup>1</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>2</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program — including the Seamless Summer Option — in July.

<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

<sup>4</sup> Additional federal reimbursement dollars is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for breakfast (not also breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a Summer Food Service Program breakfast (\$2.255 per breakfast), and were served 22 days in July 2019.

**Table 3:****Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Breakfast and School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July 2018 and July 2019, by State**

State	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2018	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2019	Percent Change in SFSP Breakfast ADP	SBP ADP, July 2018	SBP ADP, July 2019	Percent Change in SBP ADP
Alabama	15,452	14,498	-6.2%	3,405	3,783	11.1%
Alaska	849	900	5.9%	642	532	-17.0%
Arizona	5,247	6,040	15.1%	26,387	29,524	11.9%
Arkansas	7,743	6,606	-14.7%	6,583	7,158	8.7%
California	19,995	20,307	1.6%	149,352	145,104	-2.8%
Colorado	6,798	6,437	-5.3%	1,584	1,185	-25.2%
Connecticut	18,806	17,859	-5.0%	5,891	6,843	16.2%
Delaware	5,701	5,809	1.9%	1,030	765	-25.7%
District of Columbia	10,601	9,560	-9.8%	1,710	1,483	-13.3%
Florida	79,994	77,879	-2.6%	18,637	18,266	-2.0%
Georgia	34,533	33,320	-3.5%	36,889	31,037	-15.9%
Hawaii	2,683	2,239	-16.6%	1,502	2,131	41.8%
Idaho	3,104	3,062	-1.3%	619	550	-11.0%
Illinois	25,912	27,418	5.8%	17,315	17,080	-1.4%
Indiana	9,440	9,351	-0.9%	18,750	16,806	-10.4%
Iowa	5,842	5,862	0.4%	1,342	1,221	-9.1%
Kansas	4,658	4,658	0.0%	1,300	1,260	-3.1%
Kentucky	13,352	15,556	16.5%	718	0	-100.0%
Louisiana	15,102	11,967	-20.8%	2,021	1,824	-9.7%
Maine	8,441	7,480	-11.4%	304	240	-21.1%
Maryland	43,892	43,563	-0.7%	1,202	1,550	28.9%
Massachusetts	24,987	25,294	1.2%	6,766	7,973	17.8%
Michigan	24,251	22,238	-8.3%	11,119	9,426	-15.2%
Minnesota	24,987	26,139	4.6%	4,487	4,645	3.5%
Mississippi	13,327	11,591	-13.0%	1,122	1,221	8.8%
Missouri	12,035	13,308	10.6%	4,297	4,368	1.6%
Montana	3,359	3,533	5.2%	616	0	-100.0%
Nebraska	2,863	2,779	-2.9%	688	880	27.9%
Nevada	3,263	3,259	-0.1%	5,028	5,008	-0.4%
New Hampshire	3,266	3,132	-4.1%	730	656	-10.2%
New Jersey	46,960	48,374	3.0%	22,563	20,561	-8.9%
New Mexico	10,091	8,496	-15.8%	14,193	15,882	11.9%
New York	183,367	181,952	-0.8%	63,852	71,792	12.4%
North Carolina	34,477	34,167	-0.9%	16,402	13,260	-19.2%
North Dakota	1,256	1,112	-11.4%	220	0	-100.0%
Ohio	22,842	21,708	-5.0%	6,513	7,491	15.0%
Oklahoma	5,096	5,043	-1.0%	2,152	0	-100.0%
Oregon	8,468	8,496	0.3%	2,389	2,423	1.4%
Pennsylvania	26,756	26,017	-2.8%	20,630	18,484	-10.4%
Rhode Island	3,843	3,454	-10.1%	771	401	-48.0%
South Carolina	16,224	14,992	-7.6%	13,886	16,611	19.6%
South Dakota	1,874	1,549	-17.3%	1,195	0	-100.0%
Tennessee	14,059	12,835	-8.7%	16,836	13,297	-21.0%
Texas	36,897	35,037	-5.0%	61,069	78,092	27.9%
Utah	445	428	-3.8%	2,804	3,468	23.7%
Vermont	4,773	4,788	0.3%	268	142	-46.9%
Virginia	36,089	35,325	-2.1%	8,599	6,267	-27.1%
Washington	12,980	11,286	-13.1%	2,999	2,695	-10.2%
West Virginia	5,490	4,166	-24.1%	1,766	1,449	-18.0%
Wisconsin	20,206	21,358	5.7%	2,879	2,710	-5.9%
Wyoming	847	882	4.1%	291	269	-7.6%
US	943,521	923,109	-2.2%	594,310	597,813	0.6%

**Table 4:****Breakfasts Served in Summer Food Service Program, June, July,<sup>1</sup> and August 2018 and 2019, by State**

State	June 2018	June 2019	Percent Change	July 2018	July 2019	Percent Change	August 2018	August 2019	Percent Change
Alabama	571,642	542,617	-5.1%	324,485	318,960	-1.7%	15,785	13,114	-16.9%
Alaska	21,011	22,956	9.3%	17,838	19,796	11.0%	4,723	4,969	5.2%
Arizona	234,057	262,790	12.3%	110,189	132,885	20.6%	2,573	735	-71.4%
Arkansas	178,660	174,951	-2.1%	162,597	145,331	-10.6%	23,593	15,496	-34.3%
California	363,650	329,195	-9.5%	419,900	446,745	6.4%	90,587	92,951	2.6%
Colorado	234,418	232,078	-1.0%	142,760	141,610	-0.8%	20,281	15,136	-25.4%
Connecticut	38,039	47,143	23.9%	394,917	392,899	-0.5%	103,836	96,337	-7.2%
Delaware	48,672	45,473	-6.6%	119,720	127,804	6.8%	42,947	41,430	-3.5%
District of Columbia	48,108	37,327	-22.4%	222,620	210,313	-5.5%	35,209	34,399	-2.3%
Florida	2,038,456	1,823,146	-10.6%	1,679,880	1,713,334	2.0%	61,988	41,980	-32.3%
Georgia	809,811	831,968	2.7%	725,189	733,036	1.1%	41,006	52,990	29.2%
Hawaii	44,556	40,691	-8.7%	56,352	49,250	-12.6%	309	66	-78.6%
Idaho	85,936	80,999	-5.7%	65,177	67,359	3.3%	11,114	9,182	-17.4%
Illinois	276,714	247,032	-10.7%	544,146	603,203	10.9%	147,862	128,050	-13.4%
Indiana	397,397	355,345	-10.6%	198,241	205,725	3.8%	17,958	17,840	-0.7%
Iowa	162,598	148,274	-8.8%	122,676	128,971	5.1%	23,321	30,571	31.1%
Kansas	231,421	251,409	8.6%	97,827	102,482	4.8%	11,129	9,342	-16.1%
Kentucky	378,309	401,706	6.2%	280,390	342,238	22.1%	41,356	38,037	-8.0%
Louisiana	640,775	572,506	-10.7%	317,137	263,279	-17.0%	3,120	2,242	-28.1%
Maine	9,202	16,359	77.8%	177,253	164,550	-7.2%	55,357	53,636	-3.1%
Maryland	13,034	24,474	87.8%	921,740	958,394	4.0%	288,812	228,317	-20.9%
Massachusetts	24,042	47,236	96.5%	524,726	556,463	6.0%	224,455	201,510	-10.2%
Michigan	182,158	171,728	-5.7%	509,275	489,237	-3.9%	206,999	182,554	-11.8%
Minnesota	379,615	415,621	9.5%	524,719	575,048	9.6%	230,767	237,754	3.0%
Mississippi	530,608	482,002	-9.2%	279,862	255,012	-8.9%	2,559	983	-61.6%
Missouri	1,216,960	1,208,358	-0.7%	252,732	292,767	15.8%	32,151	24,738	-23.1%
Montana	77,620	71,670	-7.7%	70,541	77,725	10.2%	35,727	35,231	-1.4%
Nebraska	201,830	198,838	-1.5%	60,130	61,146	1.7%	6,471	5,467	-15.5%
Nevada	68,167	65,911	-3.3%	68,513	71,694	4.6%	20,608	21,698	5.3%
New Hampshire	7,538	9,544	26.6%	68,579	68,909	0.5%	47,873	47,063	-1.7%
New Jersey	68,323	37,355	-45.3%	986,166	1,064,237	7.9%	469,974	571,492	21.6%
New Mexico	196,132	190,328	-3.0%	211,902	186,911	-11.8%	21,317	9,004	-57.8%
New York	290,120	63,705	-78.0%	3,850,702	4,002,944	4.0%	2,282,621	2,283,067	0.0%
North Carolina	441,896	423,792	-4.1%	724,017	751,682	3.8%	203,146	175,964	-13.4%
North Dakota	54,240	60,563	11.7%	26,378	24,470	-7.2%	13,246	8,169	-38.3%
Ohio	488,655	455,908	-6.7%	479,691	477,582	-0.4%	144,416	138,325	-4.2%
Oklahoma	275,902	283,296	2.7%	107,012	110,944	3.7%	14,170	21,053	48.6%
Oregon	70,059	67,703	-3.4%	177,825	186,906	5.1%	86,811	73,253	-15.6%
Pennsylvania	206,145	212,346	3.0%	561,875	572,373	1.9%	213,565	207,014	-3.1%
Rhode Island	7,373	5,826	-21.0%	80,693	75,984	-5.8%	38,825	34,542	-11.0%
South Carolina	353,441	330,251	-6.6%	340,701	329,814	-3.2%	102,321	91,392	-10.7%
South Dakota	54,107	47,859	-11.5%	39,363	34,087	-13.4%	16,686	14,190	-15.0%
Tennessee	581,082	569,829	-1.9%	295,236	282,378	-4.4%	3,847	4,556	18.4%
Texas	1,780,722	1,772,094	-0.5%	774,829	770,809	-0.5%	246,814	194,378	-21.2%
Utah	12,603	12,692	0.7%	9,342	9,411	0.7%	2,134	2,705	26.8%
Vermont	18,220	14,190	-22.1%	100,227	105,335	5.1%	26,694	29,924	12.1%
Virginia	285,338	287,936	0.9%	757,866	777,158	2.5%	186,444	152,463	-18.2%
Washington	79,832	65,085	-18.5%	272,585	248,282	-8.9%	100,226	77,698	-22.5%
West Virginia	56,254	71,716	27.5%	115,283	91,648	-20.5%	7,278	8,495	16.7%
Wisconsin	374,552	355,947	-5.0%	424,336	469,865	10.7%	98,930	117,201	18.5%
Wyoming	27,612	32,674	18.3%	17,797	19,411	9.1%	3,823	3,778	-1.2%
US	15,237,612	14,520,442	-4.7%	19,813,937	20,308,396	2.5%	6,133,764	5,902,481	-3.8%

Note: Sponsors that served meals for no more than 10 days in June or August are allowed to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

<sup>1</sup> The Average Daily Participation (ADP) in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is calculated by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served in July by the total number of weekdays in July, minus the Independence Day Holiday. July 2019 had 22 days, compared to the 21 days in July 2018. This can result in an increase in the number of meals served, but a decrease in the ADP.

**Table 5:****Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition<sup>1</sup> in July 2018 and July 2019, Compared to Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)<sup>2</sup> ADP for School Years 2017–2018 and 2018–2019, by State**

State	Summer Nutrition ADP July 2018	NSLP ADP 2017–2018	Ratio <sup>3</sup> of Summer Nutrition to NSLP 2017–2018	Rank 2017–2018	Summer Nutrition ADP July 2019	NSLP ADP 2018–2019	Ratio <sup>3</sup> of Summer Nutrition to NSLP 2018–2019	Rank 2018–2019	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition ADP 2018–2019
Alabama	36,351	353,725	10.3	36	35,691	353,827	10.1	40	-1.8%
Alaska	3,719	38,630	9.6	38	4,160	37,174	11.2	32	11.8%
Arizona	56,979	453,132	12.6	30	69,099	440,636	15.7	21	21.3%
Arkansas	24,246	222,748	10.9	34	24,577	222,134	11.1	34	1.4%
California	413,455	2,394,192	17.3	13	398,577	2,418,693	16.5	17	-3.6%
Colorado	19,588	217,977	9.0	40	19,773	208,617	9.5	42	0.9%
Connecticut	33,977	165,497	20.5	8	34,736	183,027	19.0	9	2.2%
Delaware	10,415	61,952	16.8	16	10,673	60,650	17.6	14	2.5%
District of Columbia	15,274	44,225	34.5	1	14,983	39,776	37.7	1	-1.9%
Florida	194,458	1,435,477	13.5	29	189,431	1,371,006	13.8	27	-2.6%
Georgia	140,181	854,861	16.4	14	112,495	829,176	13.6	28	-19.8%
Hawaii	5,353	61,059	8.8	43	5,230	60,079	8.7	44	-2.3%
Idaho	17,869	89,446	20.0	9	16,154	85,659	18.9	10	-9.6%
Illinois	87,412	765,565	11.4	32	86,772	739,267	11.7	31	-0.7%
Indiana	68,609	422,701	16.2	20	63,377	420,416	15.1	24	-7.6%
Iowa	18,625	170,725	10.9	33	18,466	178,321	10.4	37	-0.9%
Kansas	17,154	179,734	9.5	39	16,744	176,132	9.5	41	-2.4%
Kentucky	35,528	399,004	8.9	41	41,449	402,568	10.3	38	16.7%
Louisiana	24,918	426,783	5.8	50	21,419	422,890	5.1	50	-14.0%
Maine	15,214	55,503	27.4	3	14,216	53,673	26.5	5	-6.6%
Maryland	65,425	292,141	22.4	7	65,366	282,772	23.1	6	-0.1%
Massachusetts	53,772	321,844	16.7	18	52,392	317,337	16.5	16	-2.6%
Michigan	65,338	522,219	12.5	31	60,720	548,381	11.1	33	-7.1%
Minnesota	46,437	268,450	17.3	12	48,114	261,705	18.4	12	3.6%
Mississippi	24,034	285,750	8.4	45	20,316	276,586	7.3	46	-15.5%
Missouri	29,343	344,534	8.5	44	30,036	332,241	9.0	43	2.4%
Montana	9,091	46,388	19.6	10	8,955	45,058	19.9	8	-1.5%
Nebraska	8,470	119,859	7.1	49	8,761	120,184	7.3	48	3.4%
Nevada	13,688	171,016	8.0	47	13,731	171,812	8.0	45	0.3%
New Hampshire	4,826	32,806	14.7	25	4,848	31,875	15.2	23	0.5%
New Jersey	95,512	420,665	22.7	6	91,698	409,752	22.4	7	-4.0%
New Mexico	45,816	169,904	27.0	5	44,973	162,650	27.7	3	-1.8%
New York	348,387	1,283,314	27.1	4	354,712	1,288,283	27.5	4	1.8%
North Carolina	90,724	632,182	14.4	27	85,055	612,905	13.9	26	-6.2%
North Dakota	2,823	31,737	8.9	42	3,172	31,272	10.1	39	12.4%
Ohio	61,926	610,719	10.1	37	61,575	590,442	10.4	36	-0.6%
Oklahoma	16,612	302,847	5.5	51	14,501	295,742	4.9	51	-12.7%
Oregon	30,808	199,394	15.5	23	30,030	187,194	16.0	18	-2.5%
Pennsylvania	89,416	637,906	14.0	28	83,734	638,671	13.1	29	-6.4%
Rhode Island	9,235	48,855	18.9	11	8,047	48,074	16.7	15	-12.9%
South Carolina	54,749	341,803	16.0	21	53,772	337,473	15.9	19	-1.8%
South Dakota	7,640	46,024	16.6	19	7,131	45,163	15.8	20	-6.7%
Tennessee	69,516	478,271	14.5	26	55,011	451,656	12.2	30	-20.9%
Texas	178,430	2,471,624	7.2	48	182,871	2,497,687	7.3	47	2.5%
Utah	25,886	154,126	16.8	17	26,870	147,666	18.2	13	3.8%
Vermont	7,826	25,236	31.0	2	7,928	23,701	33.5	2	1.3%
Virginia	64,294	424,401	15.1	24	60,598	423,640	14.3	25	-5.7%
Washington	34,867	328,735	10.6	35	35,688	327,328	10.9	35	2.4%
West Virginia	11,228	135,605	8.3	46	8,923	134,804	6.6	49	-20.5%
Wisconsin	41,996	266,666	15.7	22	42,470	273,343	15.5	22	1.1%
Wyoming	4,012	23,677	16.9	15	4,161	22,275	18.7	11	3.7%
US	2,851,457	20,251,633	14.1		2,774,183	20,041,391	13.8		-2.7%

<sup>1</sup> Summer Nutrition includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program, including the Seamless Summer Option.<sup>2</sup> School Year National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Nutrition to National School Lunch Program (NSLP) is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.



Food Research & Action Center  
1200 18th Street, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

202.986.2200  
[www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org)

Copyright © 2020 Food Research & Action Center



[@fractweets](https://twitter.com/fractweets)



[@fracgram](https://www.instagram.com/fracgram)



[facebook.com/  
foodresearchandactioncenter](https://www.facebook.com/foodresearchandactioncenter)



[linkedin.com/company/  
food-research-and-action-center](https://www.linkedin.com/company/food-research-and-action-center)